

Should the merger be approved, the fight against terrorism is bound to be downgraded, diminished, subordinated to a war on narcotics that has understandably become a matter of obsessive international concern. Such a shift in our attention and resources would seem to me senseless, dangerous and destructive.

Sincerely,

CLAIRE STERLING.

H.R. 22

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. COORDINATOR FOR COUNTER-TERRORISM.**

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There shall be within the office of the Secretary of State a Coordinator for Counter-Terrorism (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Coordinator") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(b) **RESPONSIBILITIES.**—(1) The Coordinator shall perform such duties and exercise such power as the Secretary of State shall prescribe.

(2) The Coordinator shall have as his principal duty the overall supervision (including policy oversight of resources) of international counterterrorism activities. The Coordinator shall be the principal advisor to the Secretary of State on international counterterrorism matters. The Coordinator shall be the principal counterterrorism official within the senior management of the Department of State and report directly to the Secretary of State.

(c) **RANK AND STATUS.**—The Coordinator shall have the rank and status of Ambassador-at-Large. The Coordinator shall be compensated at the annual rate of basic pay in effect for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, or, if the Coordinator is appointed from the Foreign Service, the annual rate of pay which the individual last received under the Foreign Service Schedule, whichever is greater.

(d) **DIPLOMATIC PROTOCOL.**—For purposes of diplomatic protocol among officers of the Department of State, the Coordinator shall take precedence after the Secretary of State, the Deputy Secretary of State, and the Under Secretaries of State and shall take precedence among the Assistant Secretaries of State in the order prescribed by the Secretary of State.

**LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION  
ACT OF 1995**

**HON. LEE H. HAMILTON**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1995, which contains those reform proposals recommended by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress that have not yet received full consideration by the House of Representatives.

As you know, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, cochaired by myself and Congressman DAVID DREIER, was created by Congress in August 1992 with a mandate to conduct a comprehensive study of the internal operations of Congress and provide rec-

ommendations for reform by the end of 1993. The panel completed its task, and in 1994 the House did pass one of its major recommendations—requiring the House to live under the same laws it applies to the private sector.

Unfortunately, the remainder of the joint committee's reform plan was not considered by the full House during the 103d Congress.

However, today many of the joint committee's recommendations—fully or in part—will be adopted by the House, including proposals to: Again apply private sector laws to Congress; streamline the bloated congressional committee system by reducing the total number of committees and restricting the number of committee assignments Members can have; significantly reduce the number of subcommittees; cut congressional staff; open up Congress to enhanced public scrutiny by publicizing committee attendance and rollcall votes; and require that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be a verbatim account of congressional proceedings.

The 104th Congress has made a good start toward meaningful congressional reform. These efforts have been assisted by the work of prior reform commissions such as the joint committee, as well as the continuing public demand for change. But many important components of the joint committee's reform package have not yet been considered by the House.

For example, the joint committee proposed that private citizens be included in the ethics process in a meaningful way. Under this proposal, private citizens would investigate ethics complaints against Members of the House.

Another joint committee recommendation that has not been adopted would publicize the special interest projects and tax breaks included in legislation, providing additional barriers to wasteful spending and special interest tax loopholes.

Still another joint committee proposal would streamline the Federal budget process by shifting it from an annual to a biennial cycle, reducing redundant decisions, and allowing more time for oversight. But such budget reform proposals also have not received full consideration by the House.

Because the reform effort is not complete, I am introducing the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1995, which contains all of the reform recommendations of House Members on the joint committee that have not been adopted in some form by the House. Included are the ethics, special interest, and budget reform proposals that I have mentioned. Also included are a number of additional recommendations, such as the regular reauthorization of the congressional support agencies, scheduling reform, and enhanced public understanding of Congress. My sense is that the work of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress can continue to serve as a valuable vehicle for proceeding with reform.

I intend to work with other Members to ensure that these proposals are given full consideration by the committees of jurisdiction and the entire House. And over the next few months, I also intend to introduce additional reform proposals that would strengthen the joint committee's package, and help make Congress more efficient and publicly accountable.

As I have said repeatedly over the past few years, a comprehensive reform bill should be brought to the House floor—and under a generous rule, so that Members can consider, debate, and vote on the major reform alternatives. Although some of the reforms that will be adopted today are important, these proposals are to be considered under closed rules. Free and open debate about congressional reform has not yet occurred in the House.

Again, Members should have the opportunity to vote on the major reform issues.

Congressional reform should be an ongoing process. Every year a bill should be scheduled for floor consideration dealing with institutional reform, just as the House regularly deals with legislation reauthorizing major programs and agencies.

Of course, institutional reform is no panacea. Many difficult issues are on the agenda of the 104th Congress. But sustained and meaningful change is crucial for the restoration of public confidence in Congress.

**BRUCE THOMPSON FEDERAL  
COURTHOUSE**

**HON. BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH**

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced legislation to name the new Federal courthouse in Reno, NV after the late Judge Bruce R. Thompson.

I cannot think of a more deserving Nevadan on which to bestow this honor. Judge Thompson was one of Nevada's most prominent, respected and beloved men in the Nevada legal community and led a long and highly distinguished career. After graduating from the University of Nevada and Stanford law school, he practiced law with George Springmeyer and later Mead Dixon for 27 years until 1963. He served as assistant U.S. attorney for the district of Nevada from 1942 to 1952 and as special master for the U.S. District Court of the District of Nevada from 1952 to 1953. Judge Thompson was also president of the Nevada State Bar Association from 1955 to 1956. Following a term as regent to the State planning board in 1959, he served as its chairman from 1960 to 1961. In 1963, he was appointed U.S. district judge by President John Kennedy.

His outstanding career is coupled by the immense love and respect Judge Thompson earned from his colleagues. In fact, numerous organizations representing nearly the entire legal community of Nevada have endorsed this legislation. These include, among many others, the Washoe County Bar Association, the State Bar of Nevada, the Nevada Trial Lawyers Association, the Association of Defense Council of Nevada and the Northern Nevada Women Lawyers Association.

Mr. Speaker, the House passed this bill (H.R. 3110) in the last session, only to see it die in the other body. Since construction began on this new courthouse last summer, the timeliness and importance of enacting this bill is clear. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the near future to ensure the smooth sailing of this legislation.